

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2009 ("Office Action"). Reconsideration of the current rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-42 were cancelled and claims 43-69 are now pending in the application, with claims 43, 58, 59, 60, 68 and 69 being the independent claims. Reconsideration of the current rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

PENDING REJECTIONS:

Claims 1, 20, 38 and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029194 to Lewis et al. ("Lewis") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,150 to Kravitz et al. ("Kravitz").

Claims 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Kravitz and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054003 to Chien et al ("Chien").

Claims 20-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz.

Claims 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz and Chien.

Claims 38-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been rendered moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action on page 2 rejects claims 1, 20, 38 and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 20, 38 and 40-42 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action on page 3 rejects claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029194 to Lewis et al. ("Lewis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,150 to Kravitz. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application. Applicants submit that neither Lewis, nor Kravitz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly added claims 43-69.

The Office Action on page 16 rejects claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Kravitz and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054003

to Chien et al ("Chien"). Claims 16-19 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application. Applicants submit that neither Lewis, Kravitz nor Chien, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly added claims 43-69.

The Office Action on page 18 rejects claims 20-33 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz. Claims 20-33 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application. Applicants submit that neither Lewis, nor Kravitz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly added claims 43-69.

The Office Action on page 18 rejects claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz and Chien. Claims 34-37 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application. Applicants submit that neither Lewis, Kravitz nor Chien, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly added claims 43-69.

The Office Action on page 19 rejects claims 38-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lewis and further in view of Kravitz. Claims 38-42 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. New claims 43-69 have been added to more clearly recite the inventions of the above-referenced application. Applicants submit that neither Lewis, nor Kravitz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly added claims 43-69.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

In the event any variance exists between the amount authorized to be charge to the Deposit Account and the Patent Office charges, please charge or credit any difference to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:


Daniel G. Vivarelli, Jr.
Registration No 51,137

Dated: Dec. 17, 2009

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)